

**ARIZONA PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
**Summary of Minutes**  
**January 11, 2005**

**Voting Members Present:**

Dennis A. Garrett, Director, Arizona Department of Public Safety  
Ray Allen, Assistant Fire Chief, Tucson Fire Department  
Amy Brooks, Captain, Apache Junction Fire Department  
Hal Collett, Sheriff, La Paz County, Arizona Sheriffs  
Gordon Gartner, Chief, Payson Police Department  
Jan Hauk, President, Arizona Fire District Association  
Roberto Villasenor, Assistant Chief, representing Chief Richard Miranda, Tucson Police Department  
Kathleen Paleski, Commander, Northern Arizona University PD  
Danny Sharp, Chief, Oro Valley Police Department  
Jay Vargo, representing Assistant Director Lou Trammell, Division of Emergency Management  
Dan Wills, Chief, Sedona Fire Department  
Kenneth Witkowski, Chief, Gila River Indian Community PD  
Dewayne Woodie, Captain, Ganado Fire District/EMS  
Mike Worrell, Captain, Phoenix Fire Department

**Voting Members Absent:**

Kimberly Spykes, Officer, Arizona Department of Public Safety

**PSCC Support Office Attendees:**

Lt. Colonel David Felix, Assistant Director, Criminal Justice Support Division  
Curt Knight, Executive Director, Public Safety Communications Commission  
Deidra Strickland, Administrative Services Officer, Public Safety Communications Commission  
Evelyn Jablonski, Executive Assistant, Public Safety Communications Commission

**Call to Order**

Chairman Dennis Garrett opened the meeting at 1:08 p.m. Roll call and introductions of the commission members took place.

Chairman Dennis Garrett stated commission would be unable to vote on any items today as some of the commission members still needed to complete their oaths. Paperwork is being processed to take care of this matter.

**COMMISSION ETHICS/OPEN MEETINGS LAW**

(Presentation by Ms. Diana Stabler on commission ethics and open meeting laws.) (Chapter 7 Open Meetings handout was passed out to the commission.) The following are some of the key points Ms. Stabler discussed.

What actions and activities that the commission performs apply to open meeting laws? All meetings, any gatherings (in person, by phone, e-mail, conference call, fax, and public quorum.)

Executive sessions are limited to the following topics:

- 1) legal advice
- 2) personnel matters
- 3) confidential records – (request for proposals going out)
- 4) litigation, contract negotiations, settlement discussions
- 5) employee salary discussions
- 6) international, interstate or tribal negotiations
- 7) purchase, sale or lease of real property.

Public Access:

Building security at an open meeting presents a problem in some of the secure building sites.

OMELET (Open Meeting Law Enforcement Team) – Prosecutors and legal advisors that enforce open meeting laws.

Sign-in sheets are **voluntary**. (We should state this at top of sign-in sheet.)

Mr. Knight asked for clarification on e-mail correspondence. Ms. Stabler stated if you have discussions on substantive information (benefit or compatibility of technology), it cannot be done through list serve. You specifically want to avoid getting consensus or lobbying the group on substantive issues outside the public eye. You can have a chat room (bulletin board) meeting where everyone can participate. Further clarification needed on this issue.

Assistant Director David Felix had a question regarding discussion of agenda items. Ms. Stabler stated discussion could only take place if subject matter being discussed was agenda related. Agenda items need to be listed clearly yet broadly enough that they can accommodate some wandering.

### **Building Blocks of Interoperability in Arizona**

(PowerPoint presentation by Mr. Curt Knight.)

Mr. Knight summarized our mission as 1) to develop/promote a standard-based voice/data radio system, 2) and to address the short and long-term needs of the Arizona public safety community moving forward toward interoperability.

In addressing the short and long-term needs of the Arizona public safety community, the Macro Corporation conducted a needs analysis. The outcome of that brought up the following points: where are we going, what do we need to do to build/buy, and how are we going to involve as many public safety players as possible? We then solicited input from vendors on how to go about this.

Mr. Knight stated we want to maintain a neutral platform to allow the VHF, UHF and the 800 MHz (known as IARS) systems but before we deploy these systems we need standard-operating procedures on how it's used, managed, implemented, and how different agencies will use it when they use that neutral platform.

Mr. Knight mentioned within short-term/interim needs analysis from Macro Corporation, it was suggested the Interagency Radio System (IARS) should be linked to the more modern systems being deployed today so there is a link between our legacy and modern systems. Another step mentioned was to expand the IARS radio coverage (which is limited today) across the state, some of the major highways, metropolitan areas, but not across all areas.

Mr. Knight discussed regional supervision of IARS which today is mostly unsupervised with recommendations from Macro Corporation that we have some dispatch support and regional communications center supervision of the IARS.

Mr. Knight reminded us of early successes of groups like this can help motivate planning toward the long-range as opposed to just waiting for the long-range planning we know we still need to do. We may want to focus on interim/short-term improvements to what we have today.

The long-term needs analysis brought forward three recommendations by the Macro Corporation for a statewide solution:

- 1) UHF trunk system
- 2) A hybrid UHF trunked and a 700 trunked system, with UHF in the suburban/rural areas and the 700 in the larger metropolitan areas.
- 3) 700 MHz trunked system across the state.

Of the three options, none have been adopted or voted upon by the commission or the previous committee organization of PSCC.

Assistant Director David Felix asked the question about interagency as it exists today and what that amounts to as there was some discussion on applying some funding to upgrade, modernize, clean up, and add additional sites.

### **Project 25 History and Information Briefing**

(Mesa-Phoenix Regional Communications System PowerPoint presentation of Project 25 history by Mr. Joe Noce, City of Mesa, and Mr. Bill Phillips, City of Phoenix.)

Mr. Joe Noce discussed the formation of public safety communications officials under the banner of APCO (Association of Public Safety Communications Officials, International) which provided a platform for local, state and federal groups.

- Discussions were held to come up with a radio system that provided a standard prior to manufacturing of equipment.
- Three federal agencies involved in this process: Justice, Treasury and Interior.
- TIA (Telecommunications Industry Association) partners with APCO with Memorandum of Understanding being signed by several participants.
- In 1995, the first set of standards or suite of standards is passed.
- Criticisms of Project 25 are: 1) establishing suite of standards took too long; and 2) only one single manufacturer of infrastructure today.

- Advantages: 1) equipment built to standard (1st time ever); 2) competition/price reduction; and 3) interoperability.

(Mr. Noce discussed some of the history of Project 25 as addressed below.)

The late 1980s and early 1990s, City of Phoenix-Mesa partnership determined they had identical issues with limited spectrum, aging systems and no frequencies. They agreed their needs were mutual, partnered in a consultant study and entered into an informal agreement.

In 1995, second consultant study reaffirmed the direction of going toward trunked architecture, recommending Project 25, and allowing them flexibility in developing their partnership.

(Mr. Bill Phillips took over the discussion on the history of Project 25.)

It was discussed, in 1997, an open forum took place at the City of Phoenix to bring the manufacturers together for the benefit of gathering information to educate our council and upper management on Project 25.

In 1998, a joint RFP was issued independently by Phoenix and Mesa with the first RFP for infrastructure and the second for subscribers. Motorola is the only vendor that does Project 25 trunked infrastructure and their bid was accepted.

Discussed pros and cons of Project 25 standard. The pros being: realized competition, 40 – 45% savings on subscribers (but not on infrastructure), improved interoperability, and a forward migration path as the standard continues to evolve. The cons are there is still only 1 vendor for infrastructure and the difficulty in handling of the separate contracts (infrastructure vs. subscribers).

Mr. Phillips informed the commission Department of Homeland Defense is working on a demonstration project to put a VHF trunk system onto our infrastructure which will give us interoperability between our law enforcement and federal agencies. Demonstration sites involved are some Phoenix, Mesa, and Maricopa County sheriff's offices.

Mr. Knight asked if there was going to be some outreach to other participants in the Maricopa county area that haven't been approached yet as a means of increasing the critical mass. Are you unable to, unwilling, and are we going to? Mr. Phillips responded by saying yes, they would like to and are trying to, but they are still in the middle of implementing the initial part of the system plus there are staffing and budget issues they are dealing with. Mr. Noce also responded by saying they need to get the FCC 700 MHz frequencies done to augment what they now have.

Mr. Knight asked about the 40 – 50% discount off the list for subscribers equipment which is correct. How did that compare with conventional equipment, same price or significantly less? Mr. Phillips responded trunk equipment is significantly more expensive equipment. The low-end trunk radios are about \$1,700 each, and the high-end radios are about \$4,500 – 5,000 each with all the accessories.

## **Statewide Interoperability (SIEC) Report**

(Per John Maldonado, nothing to report at this time.)

## **Status of Department of Emergency Management Projects**

(Presentation by Mr. Jay Vargo, Communications Officer, Arizona Division of Emergency Management who was filling in for Mr. Lou Trammell.)

Mr. Vargo gave an update on interoperability projects they are working on. The first project is the Statewide Fixed Facility Interoperability Communication project. Objectives of the project were to give near-term, low-cost fixed facility interoperability communications to each of the four international border counties: Yuma, Santa Cruz, Pima and Cochise. The second project was to improve mobile interoperability capabilities to support the five Homeland Security regions to build a communications vehicle for each region.

(Mr. Tom Gray, Regional Manager for RCC Consultants updated the commission on the Statewide Fixed Facility project.)

Mr. Gray gave a general overview of the project and items focused on included near-term solutions, gathering information from various counties and incorporating information into their baseline needs assessment with the 11 counties being the primary focal point. RCC Consultants looked at interoperability within and between the counties, county and state government, county and federal government. Issues in terms of interoperability include coordination, liability, funding, compatibility for the future, coverage, training, operational needs, and politics. RCC found issues are not all technology driven. In conclusion, RCC is proposing an augmentation to the existing IARS network for the benefit of producing a neutral public safety system platform.

Mr. Knight mentioned the emphasis on interagency and asked Mr. Gray if they had a chance to look at the theoretical number of talk paths in an area that might be required and if we were still talking about a single-talk path initially. Mr. Gray responded they looked at some of the throughput capacity issues based upon existing traffic and they developed a project accounting budget for implementation county-to-county as well as statewide with funding falling at the state level for implementation. Eleven individual budget statements for each of the counties plus a statewide budget were created.

Mr. Knight asked once deployed to the level beyond what it is today, how is it accessed and supervised? Mr. Gray responded they talked about the potential for statewide control and management of the network, a creation of centralized dispatch facilities. This level is primarily at a conceptual design level. When it was taken at radio channel capacity and then compared it with the number of channels, we would err on the side of excess radio counts.

## **Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) – Concept of Operations (Con Ops)**

(Presentation by Mr. Jim Ryan, Manager, Homeland Security Technology at GITA spoke on Concept of Operations document.)

Mr. Ryan discussed GITA's role in working with the PSCC group to develop our Concept of Operations document. He discussed GITA's partnership with PSCC and DPS management for

the last couple of years for the purpose of gaining an understanding of “What is the public safety communications infrastructure?” As they got more involved with this, they started running into some issues. GITA decided they must insure the following are put into practice, i.e., state’s policies, standards, procedures, best practices, and architectural schematic concept and these factors are bought into by all involved. Secondly, as the project evolves, all these factors are adopted as being the standards, procedures, best practices, etc.

Some of the questions GITA asked as they started looking into this PSCC undertaking were:

- 1) How are we going to get our hands around project?
- 2) How are we to understand what the projects deliverable by?
- 3) What are the alignments with the current standards and best practices?
- 4) How will all the end users be able to know that their needs are being met?
- 5) How do you make a good business case to sell to all the end users, the legislature, Governor’s Office, and the citizens?
- 6) Lastly, how will we be able to help the PSCC organization with its RFP?

Mr. Ryan walked us through the Concept of Operations process and their 3-fold objective. Currently, the Concept of Operations methodology is being used on a RITS (Re-engineering Integrated Tax System) for the Department of Revenue. So before they even got to the point of the RFP, they had to get all these users together to create one conceptual schematic they could all agree on operationally. The process they used was this Concept of Operations methodology which we would like for you to consider as we go forward. It is really helpful making sure all the internal/external user’s needs are met because of the detailed documentation that is required for this process. The objectives are:

- 1) It allows you to review in detail from a macro to micro perspective all the requirements from an end-user perspective.
- 2) It basically allows you to get agreement from the emergency or public safety responders on what their business vision is.
- 3) It also creates a unified case that allows you to sell this vision.

Mr. Ryan discussed the bottom line of the Concept of Operations document as a user-oriented document that has a system of operation to compare characteristics from the end-users perspective. This document will include all circumstances, objects, conditions, political, technical, commercial, and policies that will govern the proposed system. The biggest risk to a project of this scale and of this stature is basically not having clear documentation.

The City of Phoenix and City of Mesa are already trying to get in a position where technology drives them and the DEMA study is getting a little ahead of that. So Mr. Ryan stated before we get too much further into it, we need clarification on what the end game is going to be and then from that you’ll find out the technology aspect of this will fall in place.

As Mr. Ryan discussed, listed are the basic elements for the Concept of Operations document if we follow this methodology:

- 1) scope
- 2) current system or situation
- 3) justifications for nature of change
- 4) proposed concept of proposed system
- 5) operational scenarios
- 6) summary of impacts
- 7) impact analysis

With all the above components as part of the document, the outcome of a successful document should give us these benefits:

- 1) drives completion
- 2) clearly communicates requirements to general business and vendor audience
- 3) simplifies change control
- 4) allows stakeholders to read and understand requirements, level of interest

Mr. Ryan discussed the benefits of doing this is it basically supports all the balancing forces of the project required to build our business case and RFP. It helps also to clearly communicate the general business and to the federal audience what's going to happen with this when/how we spend the money. Mr. Ryan asked that we consider this as a possible methodology for developing our documentation for the PSCC project. It will require a lot of work upfront but it is essential if you're going to communicate a clear business case and marketing strategy that meets end user's needs to the stakeholders.

Assistant Director David Felix commented we (DPS) met with Mr. Ryan, and the PSCC group will be tied to GITA in reporting of this project due to being 1) a technology-driven project, and 2) for the huge amount of money involved with this undertaking. With GITA's guidance in preparing this document, we were looking to see where do we take, where do we go next in our responsibility to educate the legislature, to educate our stakeholders about exactly where we are going because there's a lot of efforts underway (DEMA and RCC). All our efforts need to be pulled together in a document that will serve as a guide for us from now through the end that clearly states our business case.

Someone asked if we had a planner coming on staff and Mr. Felix responded yes. Mr. Knight questioned whether the commission would like some more information on this to move forward. Mr. Knight mentioned we probably have the latitude within some existing state contracts to move forward with it once we have a planner on staff although we cannot make that official decision today. The other question was how far away we are from getting the planner on staff. Mr. Knight answered his best guess would be somewhere around early to mid-February. At this time we are still working on bureaucratic processes as far as establishing a new position within the Department of Public Safety.

The other question asked was whether there was a downside to the Concept of Operations document? Mr. Knight responded he didn't believe there was.

Assistant Director Felix proposed we go ahead and bring someone on board as we have the funding. He believes the cost would be nominal to have someone take this on full time to develop that for the PSCC group as the bridged document to state the business case in writing. Mr. Knight stated based on some of the early work GITA has done and suggestions as far as contracts or contractors that might be on state contract already, this puts the cost in the \$50,000-\$60,000 range as far as the document that would be our "guiding light."

Captain Mike Worrell stated he felt it was important we go through this process and it may be painful upfront but from his experience with the Phoenix project there were areas where they didn't go into much detail and in what they were looking at for the end user and they ended up having some transitional problems.

Chairman Dennis Garrett agreed this was the direction we needed to go in and this issue should be an item for the next agenda where we can have a voting quorum.

Assistant Director Felix suggested we could call a meeting prior to the planner coming on board to deal with the single issue of empowering Mr. Knight to go ahead and spend the money to acquire a consultant and have this person start work on this. When the planner is hired, that person would become the commissioners representative to the consultant and would work closely with him as this gets developed. Much work needs to be done on this so the earlier we start, the sooner a decision can be made.

### **Charter/Bylaws Review**

(Discussion on this subject by Mr. Curt Knight for informational purpose.)

Mr. Knight e-mailed the commissioners for their comments on the charter/bylaws we have drafted hopefully following our open meeting law rules via e-mail communication. If you have any comments to make, please share those with us and we will try to incorporate them into the finished document.

Ms. Kellie Geyer, Attorney General's Office, stated there was an issue with the charter and Ms. Lisa Maxie-Mullins of the Attorney General's Office would be advised of this. Ms. Geyer had not seen charter yet so she was unaware of what the issue was.

Mr. Knight asked if having an e-mail exchange sent to our commissioners for the purpose of gaining their comments would be acceptable. Ms. Geyer responded comments, additions, deletions via e-mail would be okay but suggestions would need to be discussed at the next meeting.

Assistant Director Felix asked if charter was posted on website. Mr. Knight responded no due to the fact there may be several edits before the final version is ready for posting.



## **Status – JLBC/Governor’s Reports**

(Discussion by Mr. Curt Knight for informational purposes.)

Mr. Knight discussed the financial reporting required of our office on a quarterly and annual basis with the quarterly report sent to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee office and the annual report being sent to the Governor’s Office. (Copies of the reports passed out to the commissioners.) At this point in time, there is not much to report on financially but our next report should have more activity. Mr. Knight is requesting comments/activities you would like to see reported to our governing body/funding source or if you prefer sending an e-mail with your comments to Mr. Knight or Ms. Strickland that is also welcomed.

## **Website Update – Commissioners Names Added**

(Information presented by Mr. Curt Knight.)

Updates are being made to the DPS/PSCC website appearance. Some of the historical information was taken out as it was no longer appropriate. The next four meetings were posted on the website and once the charter is adopted it will be posted as well. In the early days, we had discussions on how you would like to be displayed on the website as commissioners. Mr. Knight had some concerns about listing your direct e-mail and phone number so the information being displayed is limited to your name, title, and your agency affiliation.

We are going to take the next step and publish a generic e-mail address for all of you that would come into the PSCC support office. Within the limitations of how we can communicate via e-mail, the PSCC office would then direct the e-mail back out to you for your input or comment. Your comments on how this e-mail exchange is utilized are welcome.

## **Date, Time and Location of Next Meeting**

March 22, 2005  
South Mountain Community Center  
Saguaro Room  
212 East Alta Vista  
Phoenix, Arizona

## **New Business**

Mr. Dan Wills asked if we had a tentative agenda for the next meeting. Mr. Knight responded no but we would follow a similar structure for the next meeting with perhaps discussion of old business.

Mr. Wills named three topics for discussion for the next meeting or at some future meetings for the purpose of bringing the commissioners up on these issues.

- 1) Consolidation of planning and funding throughout the state and the five Homeland Security regions. Different sources of money are out there and possibility of replicating efforts.
- 2) Discussion of Macro report.

- 3) Consolidation related to spectrum planning of the interoperability channels in all bands.

Mr. Mike Worrell commented on SIEC (Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee) and looking at giving them clear objectives on what we expect of them related to regions. Homeland Security has defined region areas within the state to make those match up again.

Assistant Director Felix spoke of the charge of SIEC was to talk about coordinating or actual operations of a regional system, i.e., policies, procedures, protocols for using a system. If SIEC is waiting for some direction, then we need to provide them with some objectives over the next year.

### **Call to the Public**

No comments.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Knight introduced the latest staff member to the PSCC Support Office, Executive Assistant Evelyn Jablonski.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05.